DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 843 EA 005 294

AUTHOR	Marchak, Nick
TITLE	Dissensus in Expectations for the Role of the Supervisor of Instruction as Perceived by Supervisors, Principals, and Teachers. Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Volume 13, Number 10.
INSTITUTION	Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
REPORT NO	OSSC-Bull-Vol-13-No-10
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Role; Bibliographies; *Educational Research; Instructional Improvement; Public School Systems; Questionnaires; *Role Perception; Statistical Studies; Supervision; *Supervisors; *Supervisory Activities; Tables (Data); Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Supervisor of Instruction

ABSTRACT

Supervision and improvement of instruction are central concerns for educators, causing school districts to expand and specialize their supervisory services. This document addresses the responsibility and vulnerability of the supervisory position. It points up the confusion surrounding the supervisor of instruction role as perceived by professional personnel within a system, which perception could be critical for the operation of that system. The author reports on a study made to determine the divergence and congruence of role expectations held for the supervisor of instruction position by supervisors (of instruction), principals, and teachers. The study also sought to determine the divergence and congruence in supervisor role expectations through the application of the teacher variables of the size of the school in which the teachers function, the amount of teacher training, the sex of teachers, the teaching level, teacher age, and years of teaching experience. Major findings, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in detail. A copy of the survey instrument and a bibliography are appended. (Author/WM)

ED 079843

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

BULLETIN

DISSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ROLE OF THE SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERVISORS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS

by
Nick Marchak

Vol. 13, No. 10 June 1970

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL
College of Education
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

EA 005 294

ED 079843

DISSENSUS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ROLE OF THE SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERVISORS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS

by

Nick Marchak
Staffing Department
Edmonton Public School Board
Canada

Individual Copy Price - $2.50

VITA

Name: Nick Marchak

Present Position: Assistant Supervisor - Staffing
Edmonton Public School Board
Edmonton, Alberta

Educational Background:

B. Ed.	University of Alberta	196
M. Ed.	University of Oregon	1967
Ph. D.	University of Oregon	1969

Professional Experience:

Teacher, Counselor, and Assistant Principal, Lawton Junior High School, Edmonton, Alberta, 1957-63.

Assistant Principal, Kenilworth Elementary-Junior High School, Edmonton, Alberta, 1964-67.

Principal, Sherwood Elementary School, Edmonton, Alberta, 1968.

Teaching Assistant, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1968-69.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Population Studied	4
Hypotheses Tested	4
Procedure	5
PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	7
District Selection	7
Respondent Selection	7
The Instrument	8
Collection of Data	9
Analysis of Data	10
PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	11
Providing Staff Assistance	11
Inservice Activities	13
Supervision of Instruction	14
Curriculum Development	18
Personnel Responsibilities	22
MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25
Major Findings	25
Conclusions	26
Recommendations	29
APPENDIX	
A. The Instrument	30
B. Table of Critical Values of Chi-Square	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Contact by, and Response to, Questionnaire by Status Groups	9
2.	Providing Staff Assistance Ratings by All Respondents	12
3.	Significance of Respondent Expectations Toward Staff Assistance Role	13
4.	Inservice Training of Teacher Expectation Ratings by All Respondents	15
5.	Significance of Respondent Expectations Toward Inservice Training of Teachers' Role	16
6.	Supervision of Instruction Expectation Ratings by All Respondents	17
7.	Significance of Respondent Expectations Toward Supervision of Instruction Role	18
8.	Curriculum Development Expectation Ratings by All Respondents	20
9.	Significance of Respondent Expectations Toward Curriculum Development Role	21
10.	Personnel Responsibilities Expectation Ratings by All Respondents	23
11.	Significance of Respondent Expectations Toward Personnel Responsibilities Role	24
12.	Summary of the Significant Differences at .01 Level by Hypothesis and by Category Item	27

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Supervision and the improvement of instruction have been and are central concerns for educators. Because of these concerns school districts tend to expand and specialize their supervisory services. As a result of this trend, the supervisory specialists are in positions of considerable responsibility and also vulnerability. This may, in part, be due to: (1) the variety of opinion that is associated with the role of the supervisor of instruction, (2) the supervisor's historical heritage, and (3) the rapid advance of specialization in educational staff positions. Gwynn states that:

> Supervision, one of the oldest forms of educational leadership, is currently one of the most controversial despite the acknowledged importance of its role in the improvement of educational programs.[1]

To define the role of supervisors and other educational personnel is relatively easy in periods when change is less rapid. However, the problem of role definition is more difficult in periods of rapid and accelerating change in education. The difficulty may be directly related to the present challenging of old "truths," questioning of "proven" methods, and the rapid replacement of traditional content by so-called "new" programs. Under such conditions the role of the supervisor of instruction becomes vastly more complex.

Historically, supervision has an administrative heritage. Efforts to define effectively the supervisor's role have always been plagued by this heritage. In answer to this problem educational theorists and practicing school men have attempted to arrive at some consensus about concepts associated with supervision. Concepts such as scientific supervision, supervision as democratic leadership, and creative supervision, are indicative of some of the evolutionary stages that have characterized the position. Likewise, the concepts of the supervisor as an "expert," as a "resource person" and as a "process person" illustrate the evolution of the role in terms of the incumbent.

Several more recent factors that contribute to the general dilemma of the supervisor's role are: (1) the tremendous increase in knowledge, (2) the changing character of the pupils in today's schools, (3) the changing concept of teacher education, (4) significant discoveries about learning, (5) the current introduction of myriad proposals for curriculum

---

[1] J. Minor Gwynn, Theory and Practice of Supervision (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1968), p. 3.

and instructional changes and for new organizational patterns in the schools, and (6) the "new" teacher who is demanding autonomy for his professionalism and not resigning all his professional problems to a superordinate - subordinate structure.

The continuing challenge for improvement of instruction and the need for an effective school organization have been accompanied by a rapid advance of specialization in educational staff positions. School people today, in the face of diversity and complexity of the educational enterprise, are finding it increasingly necessary to turn to the specialist in instruction. In a study on school problems, Chase[2] reported that more than 35 percent of the administrators indicated that they felt the greatest need for help in the area of improving instruction.

As a specialist, the supervisor of instruction is a relative newcomer to the leadership team in school systems and as yet his role has not been clearly defined. His relationship with general administration, with the principals, and with the teachers as a whole are still in a state of confusion in many school systems.

This confusion surrounding the role of the supervisor of instruction as perceived by professional personnel within a school system, can be critical to the operation of that system. As Shafer and Mackenzie point out, ". . . clarity of role definition within any specific organization is important for the effective and efficient operation of that unit."[3] These same writers go on to say that ". . . any school system characterized by clarity of role assignment, other factors being equal, is likely to have a considerable advantage."[4]

Studies conducted by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research support this contention. In his summary of this research, Likert states:

> The supervisory act alone does not determine the subordinate's response. The subordinate's reaction to the supervisor's behavior always depends upon the relationship between the

---

[2]Francis S. Chase, "What about Improving Instruction," Administrator's Notebook (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago), Vol. 5, No. 5, January, 1957, p. 1.

[3]Harold T. Shafer and Gordon N. Mackenzie, "Securing Competent Instructional Leaders," Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965), p. 65.

[4]Ibid.

> supervisory act as perceived by the subordinate and the expectations, values, and interpersonal skills of the subordinate.[5]

Likert further suggests that a leader, to be effective, must modify his behavior to take into account the expectations of those around him.[6] He must realize that "success in social roles has been found to correlate with the ability of the role taker (actor) to predict correctly the expectations (role demands) of the role definer."[7]

The person occupying the position of supervisor of instruction holds certain role expectations for that position. He is aware of certain rights associated with that position; that is, he anticipates certain behavior to be directed toward his position by the principals and teachers with whom he interacts while in the performance of his role. At the same time principals and teachers hold certain role expectations for the supervisor of instruction as he performs the role of the position he holds. They perceive certain obligations of the supervisor of instruction; that is, they anticipate certain performances directed toward them as the supervisor of instruction performs his role.

Babcock states:

> We must examine critically the roles and functions of educational personnel so as to release the full potential of all persons who are concerned with the educational processes.[8]

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the divergence and congruence of role expectations held for the supervisor of instruction by three status groups: supervisors of instruction, principals, and teachers. The study also sought to determine the divergence and congruence in role

---

[5]Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), pp. 94-95.

[6]Ibid., pp. 89-96.

[7]David Rogers, "Spontaneity and Specificity in Social Role Relationships," Journal of Personality, Vol. 27, No. 3, September, 1959, p. 300.

[8]Chester D. Babcock, "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, 1965, NEA Publication (Washington: NEA, 1965), p. 64.

expectations held for the supervisor of instruction by six teacher variables: the size of school in which the teachers function; the amount of teacher training; sex of teachers; teaching level; years of age; and years of teaching experience.

Population Studied

A total of 791 respondents were included in this study. There were 94 supervisors, 195 principals, and 337 teachers participating in the study.

The respondents were drawn from all Alberta, Canada, school districts which employ supervisors of instruction. With the identification of the 21 school districts meeting the criteria established for the study, all 113 supervisors of instruction were selected to participate in the study. Eight of the 21 school districts identified met the criteria for the study. All the supervisors of instruction came from the eight urban school districts.

Stratified random sampling procedures were used to select principal and teacher respondents. These respondents were randomly selected through the use of a table of random numbers. Two principals and four teachers were selected for each supervisor of instruction identified for the study. The principal and teacher sample was stratified so as to provide proportional representation from elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.

Hypotheses Tested

To assist in determining whether there is congruence or divergence in the role expectations held for the supervisor of instruction by the three groups identified earlier, this study tested the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by supervisors of instruction and principals.

2. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by supervisors of instruction and teachers.

3. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by teachers and principals.

4. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by teachers from small, medium, and large schools.

5. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by teachers with different levels of academic training.

6. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by male and female teachers.

7. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by teachers from elementary and secondary schools.

8. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by teachers in different age groups.

9. There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by teachers with different numbers of years of teaching experience.

The above null hypotheses served as the basis for organization, data collection, analysis, and the presentation of results of the investigation.

Procedure

A 62-item questionnaire was used to identify respondent expectations held for certain behaviors suggested to be within the role of the supervisor of instruction.

A letter was sent to each school district superintendent explaining the study and requesting permission to include district staff in the study.

After a pilot study was conducted to validate the questionnaire, an introductory letter, a questionnaire and answer sheet and a self-addressed stamped return envelope were sent to each of the 791 respondents identified for the study. A code number was assigned to each answer sheet so that a follow-up procedure could be utilized.

After four weeks a reminder card was sent to all respondents who did not return questionnaires. Two weeks later a second questionnaire, answer sheet and self-addressed stamped envelope were sent to respondents whose questionnaires were not returned.

When the questionnaires and answer sheets were returned, they were carefully edited and coded, and the responses were transferred to IBM cards at the Testing Center at the University of Oregon.

Usable answer sheets were returned by 84.7 percent of the supervisors, 86.3 percent of the principals, and 70.8 percent of the teachers included in the study.

The University of Oregon Computer Center was utilized for computer analysis of the data. The chi-square Contingency Table Analysis with a Yates Correction was used to analyze the data. This program provided a tabulation of the frequencies of responses in each response category for each item, vertical percentages, horizontal percentages, and a chi-square computation.

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

District Selection

All school districts in the province of Alberta who employ locally appointed superintendents were contacted by mail. Those districts which employ a full-time school official (other than the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and the director) responsible for supervision of instruction were asked to participate in the study.

The districts participating were categorized into large urban districts and small urban districts on the basis of pupil enrollment. Districts with an enrollment of more than 10,000 pupils were considered large urban districts; those with a pupil enrollment of less than 10,000, small urban districts. There were four large urban school districts and four small urban school districts meeting the criteria for the study.

Respondent Selection

Supervisors

All supervisors of instruction from the selected districts were asked to participate in the study. Of the 113 supervisors of instruction contacted, 99 were from large urban school districts and 14 were from small urban school districts.

Principals

Principals were selected on a stratified random sample basis so as to include principals from different sizes of schools, from secondary schools, and from elementary schools. The number of principals selected was based on the number of participating supervisors of instruction from each district. Two principals were selected for every participating supervisor of instruction.

Teachers

Teachers were also selected on a stratified random sample basis. The study included teachers from different sizes of schools as well as a representation from elementary and secondary schools. Four teachers were selected for each supervisor of instruction identified.

The Instrument

The instrument (shown in Appendix A) used to gather data consisted of 62 statements. These statements referred to the behaviors suggested, with varying degrees of frequency, to be within the role of the supervisor of instruction. The statements were drawn from items listed in Breniman's[1] study of directors of instruction, from Jack's[2] study of curriculum personnel, from Stearns'[3] study of the role of the curriculum director, and from Hallberg's[4] study of the role of the supervisor. All four studies were descriptive in nature and listed several hundred behaviors and attributes associated with supervision and curriculum personnel.

The questionnaire developed for the study utilized a five-response Likert[5] scale. Respondents were given five response choices to discriminate their perceptions of the role of supervisor of instruction on each of the 62 items in the questionnaire. Respondents were to mark one of the following for each item:

(1) Definitely should
(2) Preferably should
(3) May or may not
(4) Preferably should not
(5) Definitely should not

The 62 statements in the questionnaire were categorized into five areas of the supervisor's function: (1) providing staff assistance, (2) inservice activities, (3) supervision of instruction, (4) curriculum development, and (5) personnel responsibilities. The 62 statements were written without categorical headings and arranged so that no two

---

[1]Warren Breniman, "The Role of the Director of Instruction" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963).

[2]Howard F. Jack, "The Position and Duties of Curriculum Personnel in Selected Public School Districts in Pennsylvania" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1962).

[3]Floyd K. Stearns, "Role Expectations of the Curriculum Directors, as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1966).

[4]Hazel I. Hallberg, "Analysis of the Expected and Actual Behaviors of Supervisors in the Role Concept of Four Professional Groups" (Unpublished docotral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1960).

[5]Rensis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology, edited by R. S. Woodworth (New York: Columbia University Press), No. 140, June, 1932.

consecutive statements were from the same category. This was done in order to remove any halo effect which might be created by having all the statements of a category grouped together.

A pilot study was conducted to test the instrument. Twenty-six teachers, seven principals, and four supervisors from one large urban school district participated in the pilot study. In addition, the questionnaire was administered to 12 doctoral candidates in a graduate research seminar at the University of Oregon. On the basis of the responses and suggestions some questionnaire items were rewritten for clarity, some items were deleted and the instructions to respondents were reworded to minimize ambiguity.

Collection of Data

The data were collected by means of a self-administering questionnaire. Respondents were asked to indicate their expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction on 62 items using a five-point Likert scale. The responses were recorded on separate answer sheets. Permission was obtained from the superintendent of each school district to contact teachers, principals, and supervisors of instruction on his staff and solicit their participation in the study. A letter explaining the study and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent to each supervisor of instruction, principal, and teacher identified by the respondent selection process.

Table 1 shows the number of respondents by status groups.

Table 1

CONTACT BY, AND RESPONSE TO, QUESTIONNAIRE BY STATUS GROUPS

Status Groups	Number Contacted	Number of Returns Received	Percentage
Supervisors of Instruction	113	94	83.1
Principals	226	195	86.3
Teachers	452	337	74.5
Total	791	626	79.1

Analysis of Data

The chi-square contingency table test for two or more independent samples was used to treat the data obtained. This test allowed for data in discrete categories with ordinal scaling to be used to determine the significance of differences between two or more independent groups.

During the preparation of the IBM cards for the computer, it became apparent that some of the cells in the contingency tables would have small observed frequencies. To compensate for minor inconsistencies, the Yates Correction Factor[6] was applied.

When the computation was completed and the data were examined, there were no responses in the Definitely Should Not category for ten items. Consideration was given to combining adjacent categories and thus changing the scale to a three-point mandatory scale.

This procedure was not undertaken for several reasons: (1) 48 of the 62 items had chi-squares that were significant at the .05 level and 38 of these were significantly different at the .02 or .01 level; (2) a three-point mandatory scale would have resulted in smaller degrees of freedom which would have had the effect of increasing all of the chi-squares obtained; (3) it was felt that the five-point scale provided a stronger increment of discrimination.

Two tests were made to determine the divergence of observed results from those expected on the hypothesis of equal probability (null hypothesis). A test of significance was made between the observed and expected results between the three status groups included in the study. The divergence between observed and expected results within the teachers' group was tested for significance. This within-group test took into consideration the variables of size of school, years of training, sex, teaching level, age, and years of teaching experience.

Only the items and variables that were significantly different at the .01 level were considered in the analysis of the data.

---

[6]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966), p. 256.

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Providing Staff Assistance

Respondents were asked to react to the following 11 items dealing with the behavior expected of the supervisor of instruction in the area of providing staff assistance:

1. (9) Give support to teachers who are willing to try out new ideas, curriculum materials and techniques in teaching.
2. (13) Assist new teachers become familiar with central office services and personnel.
3. (19) Help teachers with professional problems.
4. (35) Help get released time for teachers to attend and participate in professional meetings.
5. (39) Help get released time so teachers can observe other teachers.
6. (45) Help teachers understand the community in which they work.
7. (48) Assist teachers in organizing and managing their classrooms, including grouping of children, setting up interest centers, and advising on programs and materials.
8. (52) Assist teachers in long-term planning of their work.
9. (57) Help new and less experienced teachers plan daily lessons.
10. (63) Help teaching personnel build confidence in themselves.
11. (70) Strive to build a good working rapport between himself and the professional staff.

Table 2 indicates that respondents are generally strongly supportive of all the items in the area of providing staff assistance. Items 9 and 70 received the greatest support while statements 45 and 57 received the least support.

Table 3 presents the level of significance for the nine hypotheses on the 11 staff assistance items. Items 39 and 48 show three significant differences; items 52, 57, and 63 show two; and item 19 shows one significant difference. Items 9, 13, 35, 45, and 70 indicated no significant differences.

Table 2

PROVIDING STAFF ASSISTANCE RATINGS BY ALL RESPONDENTS

Item Number	Definitely Should	Preferably Should	May or May Not	Preferably Should Not	Definitely Should Not	Total
9	536	67	21	1	-	626
13	337	159	99	20	11	626
19	298	144	129	38	17	626
35	303	197	102	15	9	626
39	252	196	140	26	12	626
45	106	153	252	78	37	626
48	184	165	145	79	53	626
52	143	202	198	58	25	626
57	122	151	169	105	79	626
63	301	196	97	19	13	626
70	513	91	19	3	-	626

Table 3

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESPONDENT EXPECTATIONS
TOWARD STAFF ASSISTANCE ROLE

Independent Variables	Items 9	13	19	35	39	45	48	52	57	63	70
Supervisors Principals	-	.05	-	-	.01	-	.01	.01	.01	.02	-
Supervisors Teachers	-	.05	-	-	.01	-	.01	.01	.01	.01	-
Teachers Principals	-	-	-	-	.01	-	-	-	-	.01	.05
Size of School	-	-	-	-	-	.05	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Training	-	-	-	-	-	.05	.02	-	.05	-	-
Sex	-	-	.05	-	-	-	-	-	.05	-	-
Teaching Level	-	.02	.01	-	-	-	.01	-	-	.05	-
Age	-	-	-	.05	-	-	-	.05	-	-	-
Years of Teaching Experience	-	-	-	-	-	-	.05	-	-	-	-

Inservice Activities

Respondents were asked to react to the following 14 items dealing with the role of the supervisor of instruction in inservice activities:

1. (11) Help teachers develop evaluative techniques.
2. (17) Orient principals with new instructional programs.
3. (22) Call the attention of teachers to new and worthwhile professional literature.
4. (27) Organize inservice training program for the district.

5. (29) Carry out orientation programs for new and beginning teachers.

6. (34) Plan orientation programs for new and beginning teachers.

7. (40) Serve as a working member of committees when invited.

8. (41) Direct inservice training programs for the district.

9. (46) Interpret school board philosophy to teaching staff.

10. (47) Serve as a resource person upon request.

11. (53) Help teachers in understanding children better.

12. (58) Report to teaching personnel the results of attendance at all educational conferences.

13. (64) Recommend teachers for attendance at worthwhile conferences, workshops, or seminars.

14. (68) Orient teachers with new instructional programs.

Table 4 indicates that the respondents are generally supportive of most of the items in this category. Items 46, 53, and 58 did not receive strong support.

Table 5 presents the level of significance for the nine hypotheses on the 14 inservice activity items. Item 53 reveals five significant differences; items 11, 17, 22, 27, 40, 46, 64, and 68 each indicates two significant differences. One significant difference is found in item 29 and one in item 47.

Supervision of Instruction

Respondents were asked to react to the following 11 items dealing with the role of the supervisor of instruction in supervision of instruction:

1. (12) Organize and plan the district program of instructional supervision.

2. (16) Encourage principals to explore, evaluate, and use a variety of supervisory techniques.

3. (18) Encourage teachers to take leadership roles in the improvement of instructional techniques.

4. (26) Meet with staff groups on instructional problems.

Table 4

INSERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHER EXPECTATION RATINGS
BY ALL RESPONDENTS

Item Number	Definitely Should	Preferably Should	May or May Not	Preferably Should Not	Definitely Should Not	Total
11	300	219	90	14	3	626
17	346	188	65	18	9	626
22	344	185	79	14	4	626
27	311	190	99	16	10	626
29	319	158	124	18	7	626
34	314	185	109	14	4	626
40	248	204	152	15	7	626
41	210	215	164	24	13	626
46	168	198	150	68	42	626
47	337	181	89	12	7	626
53	131	178	225	67	25	626
58	50	88	204	91	193	626
64	231	239	122	22	12	626
68	287	256	66	14	3	626

Table 5

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESPONDENT EXPECTATIONS TOWARD INSERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS' ROLE

Independent Variables	Items													
	11	17	22	27	29	34	40	41	46	47	53	58	64	68
Supervisors Principals	.05	-	.01	.01	.01	.02	-	.05	-	-	.01	-	.01	.01
Supervisors Teachers	.01	-	.01	.01	-	.02	.01	-	-	.01	.01	.05	.01	.01
Teachers Principals	.01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01	-	-	-
Size of School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.05	-	-	.01	-	-	-
Sex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teaching Level	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Age	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01	-	.01	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Teaching Experience	-	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	.02	-	-	-	-	-

5. (28) Encourage principals to take leadership roles in the improvement of instructional techniques.

6. (38) Confer with individual teachers on instructional problems.

7. (42) Hold regular or frequent meetings with principals on instructional problems.

8. (49) Demonstrate specific teaching procedures for teachers upon request.

9. (54) Confer with individual principals on instructional problems.

10. (62) Evaluate methods of instruction used by teachers.

11. (66) Help teachers develop better teaching methods.

Table 6

Table 6 indicates that respondents are moderately supportive of all the items in the category of supervision of instruction.

Table 7

The level of significance for the nine hypotheses on the 11 supervision of instruction items is presented in Table 7. Items 18 and 66 each shows three significant differences; items 12, 16, 26, 28, 38, 49, and 54 each shows two significant differences. Item 62 reveals one significant difference. Item 42 does not indicate a significant difference.

Table 6

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION EXPECTATION
RATINGS BY ALL RESPONDENTS

Item Number	Definitely Should	Preferably Should	May or May Not	Preferably Should Not	Definitely Should Not	Total
12	192	203	162	46	23	626
16	267	195	106	36	22	626
18	377	181	56	6	6	626
26	365	177	67	15	2	626
28	226	218	135	31	16	626
38	354	162	75	23	12	626
42	166	236	173	38	13	626
49	290	171	105	40	20	626
54	223	235	135	27	6	626
62	114	205	174	79	54	626
66	315	215	74	17	5	626

Table 7

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESPONDENT EXPECTATIONS TOWARD SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION ROLE

Independent Variables	Items 12	16	18	26	28	38	42	49	54	62	66
Supervisors Principals	.01	-	.01	.01	-	.01	.05	.02	-	.02	.01
Supervisors Teachers	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	-	-	.01	.01	.01
Teachers Principals	-	.01	.01	-	.01	-	-	-	.01	-	-
Size of School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01
Sex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teaching Level	-	-	.05	-	-	-	-	.01	-	-	-
Age	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01	-	-	-
Years of Teaching Experience	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Curriculum Development

The respondents were asked to react to the following 17 items dealing with the behavior expected of the supervisor of instruction in the area of curriculum development:

1. (14) Prepare and write curriculum guides, courses of study and resource materials for teachers' use.
2. (20) Provide articulation between school units within a district.
3. (23) Chair curriculum committees for the district.
4. (24) Encourage principals to take leadership roles in curriculum improvement programs.

5. (25) Arrange for the utilization of test data in curriculum revision.

6. (30) Interpret the curriculum and instructional program through public appearances to local organizations.

7. (32) Appoint members to curriculum committees within the district.

8. (33) Encourage teachers to take leadership roles in curriculum improvement programs.

9. (36) Organize the program of standardized testing for the district.

10. (37) Secure lay participation in curriculum development.

11. (43) Propose curriculum changes.

12. (50) Propose ideas for evaluation of curriculum.

13. (55) Make final selection of texts and instructional materials for school use.

14. (56) Direct the development of standards for evaluation of pupil progress.

15. (59) Approve requisitions for instructional materials.

16. (61) Conduct research locally for curriculum revision and the improvement of instruction.

17. (67) Administer the budget for instructional materials.

Table 8

Table 8 reveals that respondents are not strongly supportive of items 14, 23, 30, 32, 36, 37, 55, 56, 59, and 67. The responses for items 14, 23, 32, 37, 56, and 59 are rather uniformly distributed over the five response categories. There is no directional support for these items. The response distributions for items 55 and 67 imply that the supervisor of instruction should not make final selection of texts or administer the budget for instructional materials.

Table 9

Table 9 presents the level of significance for the nine hypotheses on the 17 tasks related to curriculum development. Item 33 shows three significant differences; items 14, 20, 23, 24, 30, and 36 each indicates one significant difference. Two significant differences are found in items 43, 55, and 67. There are no significant differences at the .01 level in items 25, 32, 37, 50, 56, 59, and 61.

Table 8

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT EXPECTATION
RATINGS BY ALL RESPONDENTS

Item Number	Definitely Should	Preferably Should	May or May Not	Preferably Should Not	Definitely Should Not	Total
14	93	147	229	93	62	626
20	234	191	151	27	23	626
23	94	158	289	62	23	626
24	194	215	158	42	15	626
25	162	239	176	37	12	626
30	158	199	200	56	13	626
32	55	170	241	103	57	626
33	285	248	83	8	2	626
36	118	176	212	67	53	626
37	76	141	246	96	67	626
43	172	231	178	35	10	626
50	211	258	136	20	1	626
55	38	72	172	173	171	626
56	88	203	206	96	33	626
59	86	128	207	110	95	626
61	194	245	154	24	9	626
67	61	98	179	122	166	626

Table 9

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESPONDENT EXPECTATIONS
TOWARD CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT ROLE

Independent Variables	Items																
	14	20	23	24	25	30	32	33	36	37	43	50	55	56	59	61	67
Supervisors Principals	.02	-	-	-	-	.05	.02	.01	.02	-	.01	-	.01	-	.05	-	.01
Supervisors Teachers	-	-	-	.05	-	.01	.02	.01	.01	-	.01	-	.01	-	-	-	.01
Teachers Principals	.05	.05	.01	-	-	.05	-	-	-	.02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Size of School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Training	-	-	-	.01	.05	-	-	-	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.05	-
Teaching Level	-	-	.05	.05	-	-	-	.01	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Age	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Teaching Experience	.01	.01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Personnel Responsibilities

Respondents were asked to react to the following nine items dealing with the behavior expected of the supervisor in the area of personnel responsibilities:

1. (10) Assign teachers to grade or subject-matter area.
2. (15) Interview teacher candidates and recommend for employment.
3. (21) Assign teachers to school units.
4. (31) Recommend termination of employment of teachers.
5. (44) Evaluate teachers for record purposes.
6. (51) Participate in the selection of principals.
7. (60) Contribute to the evaluation of assistant principals for purposes of promotion.
8. (65) Evaluate new teachers for purposes of retention.
9. (69) Evaluate principals for record purposes.

Table 10

Table 10 indicates that respondents are not supportive of any of the items in the area of personnel responsibilities.

Table 11

The level of significance for the nine hypotheses on the nine items on personnel responsibilities is presented in Table 11. Items 60, 65, and 69 show three significant differences; items 15 and 31 each reveals two; items 44 and 51 each shows one significant difference.

Table 10

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBILITIES EXPECTATION
RATINGS BY ALL RESPONDENTS

Item Number	Definitely Should	Preferably Should	May or May Not	Preferably Should Not	Definitely Should Not	Total
10	48	118	176	133	151	626
15	102	144	159	108	113	626
21	38	107	207	122	152	626
31	76	101	168	109	172	626
44	64	112	146	112	192	626
51	98	102	166	83	187	626
60	74	123	158	100	171	626
65	114	143	158	99	112	626
69	45	82	140	95	264	626

Table 11

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESPONDENT EXPECTATIONS TOWARD PERSONNEL RESPONSIBILITIES ROLE

Independent Variable	Items 10	15	21	31	44	51	60	65	69
Supervisors Principals	-	.01	.01	-	-	.02	.01	-	.01
Supervisors Teachers	-	.01	.05	.01	.05	-	.05	.01	.01
Teachers Principals	-	-	-	.01	.01	-	-	.01	-
Size of School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Training	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01	-	-
Sex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teaching Level	.05	-	.05	-	-	.01	.01	-	.01
Age	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.01	-
Years of Teaching Experience	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.05	-

MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major Findings

The study tested nine hypotheses concerning the role of supervisors of instruction. The following findings are made after analysis of the data:

There are significant differences in the expectations for the role of supervisor of instruction as perceived by: (1) supervisors of instruction and principals, (2) supervisors of instruction and teachers, (3) teachers and principals, (4) teachers with different amounts of training, (5) teachers from elementary and secondary schools, (6) teachers from different age groups, and (7) teachers with different amounts of teaching experience.

There are no significant differences in the expectations for the role of the supervisor of instruction as perceived by: (1) teachers from small, medium, or large schools and (2) male and female teachers.

Significant differences between the expectations of the three status groups are found in the areas of: (1) providing staff assistance, (2) inservice activities, (3) supervision of instruction, (4) curriculum development, and (5) personnel responsibilities.

Providing Staff Assistance

There are significant differences between the expectations of supervisors, principals, and teachers for the role of the supervisor on seven of the 11 separate items in the area of providing staff assistance. In all cases the responses of supervisors are more supportive of the items than are the responses of principals and teachers.

Inservice Activities

There are significant differences between the expectations of supervisors, principals, and teachers for the role of the supervisor on ten of the 14 separate items in the area of inservice activities. In each case the responses of supervisors are more supportive than are the responses of principals and teachers.

Supervisor of Instruction

The responses of supervisors, principals, and teachers are significantly different for ten of the 11 items in the area of supervision of instruction. In each case the responses of supervisors are more supportive than are the responses of principals and teachers.

Curriculum Development

There are significant differences in the expectations held by supervisors, principals, and teachers on items in the area of curriculum development. The responses of supervisors are generally more supportive of the items.

Personnel Responsibilities

There are significant differences in the expectations of the three status groups for the role of the supervisor in the area of personnel responsibilities. The expectations among the three groups is significantly different on seven of nine items.

A majority of the responses to most of the items in the area of personnel responsibilities are recorded in the Preferably Should Not and Definitely Should Not categories. This is characteristic of the responses from all three groups. However, there are still significant differences in the expectations held on seven of the nine items.

Table 12 presents a summary of the significant differences at .01 level by hypothesis and by item category.

Conclusions

On the basis of the data presented in this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. Supervisors of instruction and principals do not hold congruent expectations for the role of the supervisor of instruction. Supervisors are generally more strongly supportive of the items describing the supervisor's role than are the principals.

2. There is lack of congruence between the expectations of supervisors of instruction and principals in the areas of providing staff assistance, inservice activities, supervision of instruction, curriculum development, and personnel responsibilities. It would appear that there are possibilities for role conflict between the two groups in all the areas of responsibility studied. The expectations of the two groups are significantly different on 22 of the 62 items in the questionnaire.

3. There is lack of congruence between the expectations of supervisors and teachers for the role of the supervisor of instruction. Supervisors are more supportive of the items describing the role of the supervisor than are teachers.

Table 12

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AT .01 LEVEL
BY HYPOTHESIS AND BY CATEGORY OF ITEM
(Numerals in the columns indicate item number)

	AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY					
Hypotheses	Provide Staff Assistance	Inservice Activities	Supervision of Instruction	Curriculum Development	Personnel Responsibilities	Number of Significant Differences
Supervisors Principals	39, 48, 52, 57	22, 27, 29, 53, 64, 68	12, 18, 26, 38, 66	33, 43, 55, 67	15, 60, 69	22
Supervisors Teachers	39, 48, 52, 57, 63	47,53,64,68 11,22,27,40	12,16,18,26,28 38,54,62,66	30, 33, 36, 43, 55, 67	15, 31, 65, 69	32
Teachers Principals	39, 63	11, 53	16, 18, 28, 54	23	31, 44, 65	12
Size of School						0
Years of Training		53	66	24	60	4
Sex						0
Teaching Level	19, 48	46, 53	49	33	51, 60, 69	9
Years of Age		40, 46	49		65	4
Years of Teaching Experience				14, 20		2
Total in Each Area	13	21	21	15	15	85

4. There is lack of congruence in expectations held by supervisors and teachers in all of the areas of responsibility studied. The expectations of the two groups are significantly different on 32 of the 62 items in the questionnaire.

5. Each of the areas of responsibility studied could provide sources of role conflict between supervisors and teachers. This is particularly evident in the areas of inservice, supervision of instruction, curriculum development, and personnel responsibilities.

6. Teachers and principals do not hold congruent expectations for the role of the supervisor of instruction. In general, principals are more supportive of the statements describing supervisory behavior than are the teachers.

7. Each of the areas of responsibility studied could provide a source of conflict between the expectations of teachers and principals. The possibilities for conflict appear to be greater in the area of supervision of instruction and personnel responsibilities.

8. There is more consensus between principals and teachers for the role of the supervisor of instruction than there is between supervisors and principals and between supervisors and teachers.

9. Years of teacher training do not provide a strong source of conflict among teachers for the role of the supervisor of instruction.

10. There is lack of congruence between the expectations of elementary and secondary teachers for the role of the supervisor of instruction. In general, secondary teachers are less supportive of the items describing supervisory behavior than are elementary teachers.

11. The expectations of teachers for the role of the supervisor in the areas of providing staff assistance, inservice, and personnel responsibilities may provide a source of conflict between elementary and secondary teachers.

12. Years of teaching experience and teacher age do not appear to provide strong sources of conflict in the expectations of teachers for the role of the supervisor.

13. Teacher sex and the size of the school in which teachers work do not appear to influence significantly the expectations teachers hold for the role of the supervisor of instruction. The expectations held for the role of the supervisor by male and female teachers and by teachers from different sized schools were remarkably congruent.

14. The role of the supervisor is not clearly defined. By their responses, the supervisors indicated that they perceive their role as requiring performance of many divergent tasks.

15. Supervisors perceive themselves as occupying a rank between teacher and principal.

16. The lack of congruence in expectations for the role of the supervisor of instruction by supervisors and principals, and by teachers and principals, may well be symptomatic of the development of two incompatible situations. The growing tendency for the expansion of central office supervisory services may be incompatible with the increasing specialization and expertise of teaching personnel. The lack of congruence in role expectations for the role of the supervisor may be a manifestation of a desire for autonomy and freedom from external supervision by teachers and principals.

Recommendations

On the basis of the analysis of the data gathered in this study, the following recommendations are suggested for consideration:

1. The role of the supervisor of instruction should be changed. The position should be staff and not line.

2. The authority or influence of the supervisor's position should be derived from expertise or knowledge in supervision and not from rank.

3. The role of the supervisor should be legitimated. It should be made congruent with the expectations of the groups served by the incumbent.

4. The role of the supervisor should be clearly defined. Non-instructional duties should not be assigned to the formal role.

5. In defining the role of the supervisor, care should be taken to avoid assigning too many duties to the formalized role. Limiting the duties may increase the probability of adequate role performance.

6. The supervisor's role should be communicated to new as well as experienced principals and teachers through district orientation programs.

7. The supervisor's role should be continuously re-evaluated and modified to meet the needs of the instructional staff and the instructional program.

8. Some form of inservice or organizational development should be undertaken to develop trust and confidence between instructional personnel and supervisors.

9. The training, selection, and retention of supervisors should be given careful attention. Incumbents selected should have a strong background in the area, expertise in supervisory techniques, and competence in human relations skills.

APPENDIX A

Dear Colleague:

The supervisor of instruction is a relative newcomer to the leadership team in many school systems. As a result, his role has not been clearly defined. His relationship with the principals and teachers is frequently in a state of confusion. This condition can be critical to the operation of a school system.

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study being made to examine the role of the supervisor. Your responses will help in understanding what expectations teachers, principals, and supervisors hold for the role of the supervisor.

For the purpose of this study, a supervisor of instruction is defined as a professionally trained person assigned to the office of the superintendent of schools. In your district he may be (1) a general supervisor, (2) a supervisor for a particular level (division one, division two, junior high, or senior high), (3) a supervisor for a particular subject area (music, art, physical education, math, etc.), or (4) an assistant supervisor for either 1, 2, or 3 above. His rank is less than that of an assistant superintendent and also below that of a director. His work is almost exclusively instructional leadership (supervision).

This study will attempt to gather information from personnel in selected Alberta school districts. The focus of the study is on the total responses made by each status group (supervisors, principals, and teachers). Your superintendent's consent has been obtained to include staff from your district in this study.

If you feel that the results of this study may be of interest to you, please print your mailing address at the bottom of this page and I will be glad to forward a summary of the findings on completion of the study. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return both the answer sheet and the questionnaire as soon as possible. A self-addressed and stamped envelope is provided for your convenience. My sincere thanks for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Nick Marchak
Graduate Assistant
1231 - 16th Way
Eugene, Oregon

John H. Hansen
Assistant Chairman
Curriculum and Instruction
Chairman, Doctoral Committee

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

This survey consists of a QUESTIONNAIRE and an ANSWER SHEET. Please place all your responses using an HB pencil on the ANSWER SHEET. If you wish to change your response, be sure to erase your first mark completely.

Each of the numbered items in the QUESTIONNAIRE has a corresponding numbered row with response columns (lettered A, B, C, D, and E) on the accompanying ANSWER SHEET. (Please ignore the T and F found above response column A and B in the answer sheet). DO NOT PLACE YOUR NAME ON THE ANSWER SHEET AND DO NOT COMPLETE THE TOP ONE-THIRD OF THE ANSWER SHEET.

The QUESTIONNAIRE has TWO PARTS. PART ONE requires you to provide information about yourself. PART TWO of the QUESTIONNAIRE requires you to indicate your expectations for the ROLE OF THE SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION.

DIRECTIONS FOR PART ONE:

PART ONE consists of eight numbered items (items 1 through 8) each of which has several response categories. The response categories are coded with the letters A, B, C, D, or E. For each numbered item select the letter (A, B, C, D, or E) of the response category that describes you, and place a BOLD PENCIL MARK in the column with the same letter (A, B, C, D, or E) in the correspondingly numbered row of columns on the answer sheet. For example, in question one (1) if you are a teacher, the letter C describes your position. On the ANSWER SHEET you would find the row of response columns numbered one (1) and mark C column in that row.

PART ONE: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Respondent's Position
   (A) Supervisor of Instruction
   (B) Principal
   (C) Teacher

2. Size of School
   (A) 1 to 7 teachers
   (B) 8 to 14 teachers
   (C) 15 to 21 teachers
   (D) 22 to 28 teachers
   (E) 29 or more teachers

3. Kind of School
   (A) Elementary
   (B) Elementary-Junior High
   (C) Junior High
   (D) Junior High-Senior High
   (E) Senior High

4. Years of Teacher Training (as evaluated for salary purposes)
   (A) two or fewer
   (B) three
   (C) four
   (D) five
   (E) six or more

5. Sex
   (A) Male
   (B) Female

6. Teaching Level
   (A) Primary Grade (1 to 3)
   (B) Intermediate (4 to 6)
   (C) Junior High (7 to 9)
   (D) Senior High (10 to 12)

7. Years of Age
   (A) Under 25
   (B) 25 to 29
   (C) 30 to 34
   (D) 35 to 44
   (E) 45 and over

8. Years of Teaching Experience, Including This Year
   (A) 2 or less
   (B) 3 to 5
   (C) 6 to 10
   (D) 11 to 15
   (E) 16 and over

PART TWO: ROLE INVENTORY

Directions:

Please respond on the ANSWER SHEET to the items 9 through 70 in the QUESTIONNAIRE using the five categories of responses as answers to:

1. Supervisor's Question: As a supervisor of instruction, what obligations do you feel that you have to do or not to do the following things?

2. Principal's and Teacher's Question: As a principal (teacher), what expectations do you hold for the supervisor of instruction doing or not doing the following?

The categories of responses given at the top of each page are as follows:

A. Definitely Should (DS).
B. Preferably Should (PS).
C. May or May Not (MMN).
D. Preferably Should Not (PSN).
E. Definitely Should Not (DSN).

Directions:
(a) READ each numbered item carefully.
(b) Decide which letter (A, B, C, D, or E) describes your response to that item.
(c) Find on the ANSWER SHEET the number (9 through 70) of response row that corresponds to the number of the question read on the QUESTIONNAIRE.
(d) Place a BOLD PENCIL MARK ON THE ANSWER SHEET in one of the five columns (A, B, C, D, or E) to show the response you have selected for that item number in the QUESTIONNAIRE.
(e) Respond to each item.

Sample Statement

	DS	PS	MMN	PSN	DSN
00. Help teachers discipline students.	A	B	C	D	E

If you feel that the supervisor of instruction definitely should help teachers discipline students, you would place a BOLD PENCIL MARK in the "A" column in the row of responses on the ANSWER SHEET. If you feel that he may or may not help teachers discipline students, you would place a BOLD PENCIL MARK in column "C" in the row of responses on the ANSWER SHEET. Go through each of the items in this manner.

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS AND YOU SHOULD RESPOND ACCORDING TO THE EXPECTATIONS YOU HOLD FOR THE ROLE OF THE SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION AND NOT NECESSARILY AS THE ROLE IS PERFORMED IN YOUR DISTRICT.

	DS	PS	MMN	PSN	DSN
9. Give support to teachers who are willing to try out new ideas, curriculum materials and techniques in teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
10. Assign teachers to grade or subject-matter area.	A	B	C	D	E
11. Help teachers develop evaluative techniques.	A	B	C	D	E
12. Organize and plan the district program of instructional supervision.	A	B	C	D	E
13. Assist new teachers become familiar with central office services and personnel.	A	B	C	D	E
14. Prepare and write curriculum guides, courses of study, and resource materials for teacher's use.	A	B	C	D	E
15. Interview teacher candidates and recommend for employment.	A	B	C	D	E
16. Encourage principals to explore, evaluate, and use a variety of supervisory techniques.	A	B	C	D	E
17. Orient principals with new instructional programs.	A	B	C	D	E
18. Encourage teachers to take leadership roles in the improvement of instructional techniques.	A	B	C	D	E
19. Help teachers with their professional problems.	A	B	C	D	E

		DS	PS	MMN	PSN	DSN
20.	Provide articulation between school units within a district.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Assign teachers to school units.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Call the attention of teachers to new and worthwhile professional literature.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Chair curriculum committees for the district.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Encourage principals to take leadership roles in curriculum improvement programs.	A	B	C	D	E
25.	Arrange for the utilization of test data in curriculum revision.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Meet with staff groups on instructional problems.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Organize inservice training programs for the district.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Encourage principals to take leadership roles in the improvement of instructional techniques.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Carry out orientation programs for new and beginning teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Interpret the curriculum and instructional program through public appearances to local organizations.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Recommend termination of employment of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Appoint members to curriculum committees within the district.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Encourage teachers to take leadership roles in curriculum improvement programs.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Plan orientation programs for new and beginning teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	Help get released time for teachers to attend and participate in professional meetings.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Organize the program of standardized testing for the district.	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Secure lay participation in curriculum development.	A	B	C	D	E

		DS	PS	MMN	PSN	DSN
		A	B	C	D	E
38.	Confer with individual teachers on instructional problems.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	Help get released time so teachers can observe other teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	Serve as a working member of committees when invited.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	Direct inservice training programs for the district.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	Hold regular or frequent meetings with principals on instructional problems.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	Propose curriculum changes.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	Evaluate teachers for record purposes.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	Help teachers understand the community in which they work.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	Interpret school board philosophy to teaching staff.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	Serve as a resource person upon request.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	Assist teachers in organizing and managing their classrooms, including grouping of children, setting up interest centers and advising on programs and materials.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	Demonstrate specific teaching procedures for teachers upon request.	A	B	C	D	E
50.	Propose ideas for evaluation of curriculum.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	Participate in the selection of principals.	A	B	C	D	E
52.	Assist teachers in long-term planning of their work.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	Help teachers in understanding children better.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	Confer with individual principals on instructional problems.	A	B	C	D	E
55.	Make final selection of texts and instructional materials for school use.	A	B	C	D	E

	DS	PS	MMN	PSN	DSN
56. Direct the development of standards for evaluation of pupil progress.	A	B	C	D	E
57. Help new and less experienced teachers plan daily lessons.	A	B	C	D	E
58. Report to teaching personnel the results of attendance at all educational conferences.	A	B	C	D	E
59. Approve requisitions for instructional materials.	A	B	C	D	E
60. Contribute to the evaluation of assistant principals for purposes of promotion.	A	B	C	D	E
61. Conduct research locally for curriculum revision and the improvement of instruction.	A	B	C	D	E
62. Evaluate methods of instruction used by teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
63. Help teaching personnel build confidence in themselves.	A	B	C	D	E
64. Recommend teachers for attendance at worthwhile conferences, workshops, or seminars.	A	B	C	D	E
65. Evaluate new teachers for purposes of retention.	A	B	C	D	E
66. Help teachers develop better methods of teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
67. Administer the budget for instructional materials.	A	B	C	D	E
68. Orient teachers with new instructional program.	A	B	C	D	E
69. Evaluate principals for record purposes.	A	B	C	D	E
70. Strive to build a good working rapport between himself and the professional staff.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX B

TABLE OF CRITICAL VALUES OF CHI-SQUARE*

df	Probability under H_o that X^2 >Chi-Square			
	.10	.05	.02	.01
4	7.78	9.49	11.67	13.28
8	13.36	15.51	18.17	20.09

*This table is abridged from Table C of Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 249.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babcock, Chester D. "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," Role of the Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. 1965 Yearbook. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.

Chase, Francis S. "Factors Productive of Satisfaction in Teaching," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951.

Chase, Francis S. "How to Meet Teacher's Expectations of Leadership," Administrator's Notebook. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago. Vol. 1, No. 9 (April, 1953).

Chase, Francis S. "What About Improving Instruction," Administrator's Notebook. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center. Vol. 5, No. 5 (January, 1957).

Cleminson, Geraldine. "The Major Purposes and Functions of Supervision as Perceived by New Jersey Public School Superintendents, Supervisors and Building Principals," The Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 61, No. 9 (May-June, 1968).

Cohen, Arthur R. Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Cottrell, Leonard. "The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles," American Sociological Review. Vol. 7 (October, 1942).

Ferneau, Elmer F. "Role Expectations in Consultations," Administrator's Notebook. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago. Vol. 11, No. 8 (April, 1954).

Festinger, Leon. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston: Row Peterson, 1957.

Frazier, Calvin M. "Role Expectations of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964.

Getzels, J. W. "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review. Vol. 65, 1957.

Gwynn, J. Minor. Theory and Practice of Supervision. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1968.

Gross, Neal, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Hallberg, Hazel I. "Analysis of the Expected and Actual Behaviors of Supervisors in the Role Concept of Four Professional Groups," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1960.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950.

Jackson, Jay. A Conceptual and Measurement Model for Norms and Roles. Pre-publication draft, Comparative Studies of Mental Health Organization. Kansas: University of Kansas, 1963.

Jackson, Jay. "Structural Characteristics of Norms." 1960 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, LIX. Part Two: The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Kerch, David, Richard Crutchfield and Egerton Ballachy. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

King, Mary L. "Concepts of the Role of the Supervisor in the Improvement of Instruction in Ohio County School Districts," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957.

Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology. New York: Columbia University Press. No. 140 (June, 1932).

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1936.

Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil. Supervision--A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Newcomb, Theodore. Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.

Parsons, Talcott. Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe: Free Press, 1959.

Reid, John E. "Task Expectations of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Principals, Superintendents, Teachers, School Boards and the Public," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967.

Rogers, David. "Spontaneity and Specificity in Social Role Relationships," Journal of Personality. Vol. 27, No. 3 (September, 1959).

Sarbin, Theodore. "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.

Shafer, Harold T., and Gordon N. Mackenzie. "Securing Competent Instructional Leaders," Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. 1965 Yearbook. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Stearns, Floyd R. "Role Expectations of the Curriculum Director as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1966.

Trow, William C. "Role Functions of the Teacher in the Instructional Group," 1960 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, LIX, Part Two: The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Utsey, Jordan B. "Instructional Leadership Actions of Elementary School Principals," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1963.